

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully studied the outstanding Official Action. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the application, claims 2, 19-24, 35, 38-39, 43, 60-65 and 76-78 are currently pending. Claims 2, 19, 35, 38, 43, 60 and 76 are amended. Claims 77-78 are canceled without prejudice.

Claims 19-24, 35, 38-39, 60-65 and 76-78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nathan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,197,450).

Claims 2 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nathan in view of the "Background of the Invention" section of the present application.

Applicants express their appreciation to Examiners Thomas Parsons and Patrick Ryan for the courtesy of a personal interview, which was granted to Applicants' representative, Sanford T. Colb (Reg. No. 26,856), on November 3, 2008, at the USPTO. The substance of the interview is set forth in the Interview Summary.

In the interview, all the pending claims were discussed vis-à-vis the prior art of Nathan et al. The Interview Summary Record states, in relevant part, "Discussed the unobviousness of using MCPs in the claimed electrical energy storage device in view of the fact that prior to the invention MCPs were used in the art of radiation and electron detection but not in any art analogous to the claimed electrical energy storage device. Arguments presented overcome the rejection of record".

The following discussion is included for the sake of the record only.

As discussed in the interview, MCPs have been used in the art of radiation and electron detection, but have never been used in the art of electrical energy storage or in any analogous art. Thus, it would not have been obvious to use an MCP for the creation of an electrical energy storage device, as claimed in the present invention.

Additionally, the prior art of record does not describe MCPs, but rather only MEESCs. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have used the teachings of the prior art of record to fabricate an electrical energy storage device as described in the present invention.

Applicants have amended independent claims 19, 35, 38, 60 and 76 to recite an MCP,

thereby to clarify the novelty of the present invention over the prior art of record.

Thus, none of the prior art of record, alone or in combination, shows or suggests the present invention as recited in independent claims 19, 35, 38, 60 and 76.

With reference to the above discussion, independent claims 19, 35, 38, 60 and 76 are deemed patentable over the prior art of record and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 2, 20-24, 39, 43 and 61-65 depend directly or ultimately from the above mentioned independent claims and recite additional patentable subject matter and therefore are deemed patentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all of the claims are deemed to be allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Dated: November 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

S. Peter Ludwig

Registration No.: 25,351

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant